

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed the above-referenced case on May 29, 2008. Claims 59-64 are standing for examination, and stand as presented in the last response with no amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In the action claims 59-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chinni (US 6,205,135) hereinafter Chinni.

Examiner's rejection

Claims 59-64 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *CHINNI* et al. (US 6,205,135), hereinafter Chinni.

Regarding claim 59, Chinni discloses a telephony bridge unit (alternate access platform 100 functions as a bridge, see figure 1), comprising:

- a first interface for connecting to a connection-oriented switched telephony (COST) network (one interface of alternate access platform 100 "AAP" coupled to local exchange 150, which is part PSTN, see figure 1 and col. 3 lines 8-11);

- a second interface for connecting to a data network for data network telephony (DNT) calls (second interface for connecting to Internet, see figure 1);

- a protocol converter for converting calls between DNT and COST network protocols;

- a processor for managing operations of the bridge unit (the CPU 120 in AAP 100 see figure 2); and

- a data repository storing code and data;

wherein the bridge unit, receiving a call from a caller on the COST network (see col. 2 lines 24-26), accesses a look-up table in the data repository relating COST telephone numbers to data network addresses (see col. 6 lines 16-30),

retrieves a data network address associated with the COST telephone number (see col. 6 lines 16-30),

places a data network call on the DNT network to a destination using the data network address (see col. 6 lines 16-30), connects the incoming COST and outgoing DNT calls (see col. 6 lines 16-30), and

translates protocol in both directions between the COST and the DNT networks while the calls are connected (the AAP 100 translates the protocol between the PSTN (circuit switch) and the Internet (packet switch), see figure 1 and col. 6 lines 16-30), and in the event of receiving a call on the data network,

accesses information in the received call indicating a COST telephone number, places a call on the COST network to the COST number, connects the incoming DNT and outgoing COST calls, and translates protocol in both directions between the DNT and the COST networks while the calls are connected (see col. 6 lines 16-30; and col. 6 lines 50-43).

Applicant's response

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for conducting a new search and providing new art in this 20th Office Action. Applicant is confident that the present art of Chinni will be overcome, just as all of the other references applied have been throughout the lengthy history of this case. Applicant points out that although the claims presented in this case were newly written in the Response filed on 7/30/2007, the present claims contain basically the same subject matter contained in the claims as originally filed and Appealed. At this point in the prosecution phase Applicant will reserve the right to hope that at some point in the distant future the Patent Office and this Examiner will stop doing further and further and further searches for new art and finally allow the case.

Regarding the art of Chinni it is clear to Applicant that Chinni falls considerably short of reading on all of applicant's claimed subject matter in several ways. Firstly, Chinni teaches two separate alternate access platforms, 100 and 200, which the Examiner

relies upon to teach the functions of applicant's claimed single Bridge Adapter Unit. Additionally, the IP address associated with received COST calls and the COST call telephone numbers received with a received DNT call are for said alternate access platforms in the network, not intended final destinations of the calls placed as DNT or COST calls, as claimed. Applicant has amended the independent claims in this response to clarify this point, although that has been the meaning as claimed all along. Further, the COST call number retrieved from a received DNT call in Chinni is actually not a DNT call from a caller, as claimed, but merely a signaling transmission for call set up. Applicant provides the main portion of Chinni, column 6, lines 16-30, as relied upon by the Examiner below:

FIG. 1. In contrast, if alternate access platform 100 selects an Internet line for routing the call, then alternate access platform 100 establishes a data connection with another alternate access platform, herein represented by alternate access platform 200. In order to establish this data connection, alternate access platform 100 "maps" the called party telephone number into an IP address. As such, alternate access platform 100 additionally stores a "mapping table" (not shown) that associates the area code portion of a called party telephone number with a respective IP address of another alternate access platform. In this example, the area code of the called party is used by alternate access platform 100 to index into this "mapping table" to retrieve an associated IP address that corresponds to alternate access platform 200, i.e., IP address 188.333.409.200.

Applicant herein amends the independent claims to clarify that it is actually the final destination IP address or COST telephone number intended by the caller making the call that is accessed in the database or retrieved in the DNT call by the claimed Bridge Adapter unit. Further, it is clear in the teaching of Chinni that what the Examiner considers a received DNT call in Chinni is actually a call setup signaling message to set up a call on a data network, not the actual communicated call from a DNT caller, as claimed (col. 6, lines 36-39).

Applicant teaches and claims a unique Bridge Adapter Unit serving as a universal bi-directional connection between PSTN 13 and Internet 15. For example, bridge 87 has the ability to convert COST calls to IPNT and IPNT calls to COST format, and also to receive and place calls of both types. A COST telephone number may be encoded by an agent in call center 89 into an IP address of the bridge, and the bridge is adapted to extract that COST number from the IP address or other header in an incoming IP call from the call center. The coded portion of the IP address may also have just a key instead of the entire COST number, and the key may allow look-up in a stored table at the bridge to certain the COST number to which the call may be connected and translated.

Applicant argues that Chinni at least fails to teach retrieving COST numbers from actual DNT calls and a single Bridge Adapter Unit as taught and claimed in applicant's invention. Applicant looks forward to receiving Office Action number 21 including a new search and new art, which applicant is confident will also be overcome.

Summary

The applicant is confident that the art cited and applied does not teach the patentable features of these claims, as claimed, and therefore solicits allowance, and that the case be passed quickly to issue. As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended and argued above over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dan Kikinis

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
(831) 768-1755